Applicant: Michael B. Northcott et al.

Attorney's Docket No.:

Serial No.: 10/081,268 Filed: Feb. 22, 2002

Page : 2 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 10018686-1 Amendment dated May 15, 2006 Reply to Office action dated Feb. 14, 2006

Amendments to the Claims

The following Listing of Claims replaces all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application.

Listing of Claims:

Claim 1 (currently amended): A method of identifying potential business opportunities, comprising:

identifying determining a target customer need state based upon an analysis of from marketplace data associating potential target customer need states with respective parameters values;

identifying a process representing a current marketplace response that addresses the determined target customer need state;

generating a <u>process</u> map of a process for addressing the identified target customer need state, the process map including comprising a network of tasks <u>involved</u> in the identified process;

each having one or more associated values ranking the tasks of the process map; and identifying selecting a highest ranked one of the tasks of the process map as a potential point of intervention in the identified process-based at least in part upon an analysis of the values associated with the tasks in the process map; and

producing a list of one or more customer needs associated with the selected task.

Claim 2 (currently amended): The method of claim 1, wherein identifying a target eustomer need state the determining comprises scanning the marketplace data to identify the target customer need state without foreknowledge of any of the potential target customer need states.

Claim 3 (currently amended): The method of claim 1, wherein-identifying a target eustomer need state the determining comprises scanning marketplace data in accordance with a preselected one of the potential target customer need states to identify the target customer need state.

Attorney's Docket No.: 10018686-1 Applicant: Michael B. Northcott et al.

Amendment dated May 15, 2006 Serial No.: 10/081,268 Reply to Office action dated Feb. 14, 2006 Filed : Feb. 22, 2002 Page : 3 of 12

Claim 4 (currently amended): The method of claim 1, wherein the determining comprises selecting as theidentified target customer need state one of the potential target customer need states in the marketplace data that is associated with a highesteorresponds to a customer need state associated with a relatively high total cost value.

Claim 5 (currently amended): The method of claim 1, wherein identifying a target eustomer need statethe determining comprises selecting from the marketplace data a subset of the potential target customer need states and associating with each of the selected potential target customer need states a set of one or more tasks.

Claim 6 (currently amended): The method of claim 5, further comprising assigning associating respective values to the tasks associated with each of the selected potential target customer need states.

Claim 7 (currently amended): The method of claim 6, wherein values for the associating comprises respectively assigning one or more of the following task parameter metrics are assigned to the associated tasks associated with each of the selected potential target customer need states: a cost metric, an incidence rate metric, and a metric measuring diversity of association with different potential target customer need states.

Claim 8 (currently amended): The method of claim 7, further comprising ranking the selected potential target customer need states in accordance with the values assigned to the associated tasks.

Claim 9 (canceled)

Claim 10 (currently amended): The method of claim 91, further comprising estimating values of unit costs-values, incidence rates, total costs, and outcomes for each task in the generated process map generated for the representative process.

Claim 11 (currently amended): The method of claim 10, wherein identifying a potential point of intervention comprises selecting a potential target task from the tasks in the

Attorney's Docket No.: 10018686-1 Applicant: Michael B. Northcott et al. Amendment dated May 15, 2006

Reply to Office action dated Feb. 14, 2006

Serial No.: 10/081,268 : Feb. 22, 2002 Filed

: 4 of 12 Page

representative process mapthe ranking is based at least in part upon one or more of the estimated unit cost values, incidence rates, total costs, and outcomes.

Claim 12 (currently amended): The method of claim 111, further comprising wherein the producing comprises mapping the potential target selected task into a network of one or more sub-tasks.

Claim 13 (currently amended): The method of claim 121, further comprising generating a list of listing one or more projected customer problems based at least in part upon the potential target task mapping associated with the selected task.

Claim 14 (currently amended): The method of claim 13, further comprising wherein the producing comprises identifying the generating a list of one or more projected customer needs based at least in part upon the listedprojected customer problems list.

Claim 15 (currently amended): The method of claim 141, wherein the producinggenerating the projected customer needs list comprises identifying customer needs aspects of the selected task that enable at least one of a reduction of a cost of the identified process and an improvement in an outcome of the identified process correspond to business opportunities for reducing cost or improving outcomes, or both.

Claim 16 (currently amended): The method of claim 141, further comprising assessing associating a customer assessment value associated with each of the projected customer needs in the produced list, and selecting one of the customer needs in the produced list having a highest customer assessment value as a source of a lead for a potential business opportunity.

Claim 17 (currently amended): The method of claim 141, wherein generating the projected customer needs list the ranking comprises assigning values to the tasks in accordance with their potential impact on at least one ofidentifying customer needs associated with specific tasks and focused on reducing a cost of the identified process and or improving an outcome of the identified process-outcomes, or both.

Applicant: Michael B. Northcott et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 10018686-1

Serial No. : 10/081,268 Filed : Feb. 22, 2002 Page : 5 of 12 Amendment dated May 15, 2006 Reply to Office action dated Feb. 14, 2006

Claim 18 (currently amended): The method of claim 141, further comprising correlating one or more of the projected customer needs in the produced list with one or more core competencies and resources.

Claim 19 (currently amended): The method of claim 18, further comprising selecting for further investigation one or more of the target projected customer needs in the produced list well-correlated having highest correlations with the one or more core competencies and resources.

Claim 20 (canceled)

Claim 21 (new): The method of claim 1, wherein the ranking is based at least in part on total cost metric values assigned to the tasks of the process map.

Claim 22 (new): The method of claim 1, wherein the ranking is based at least in part on assessments of developmental maturity of the tasks of the process map.

Claim 23 (new): The method of claim 1, wherein the determining comprises determining as the target customer need state a target disease state from medical marketplace data associating potential target disease states with respective parameter values, and the identifying comprises identifying as the representative process a clinical pathway for the determined target disease state.